

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

From: Russell Gorton <gorton@umich.edu>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(GTRISTAN),K4DOM.K4PO2(MPOWELL,SNES),K...
Date: Wed, Jun 30, 1999 1:35 PM
Subject: Ameritech/SBC merger

RECEIVED

JUL 29 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

To: FCC Chairman William Kennard: bkennard@fcc.gov
Commissioner Susan Ness: sness@fcc.gov
Commissioner Harold Furchtgott-Roth: hfurchtg@fcc.gov
Commissioner Michael Powell: mpowell@fcc.gov
Commissioner Gloria Tristani: gtristan@fcc.gov

Subj: Ameritech/SBC merger

98-141

I'll keep this as brief as possible.

The Ameritech/SBC merger frightens me, a "regular" consumer of telephony services. The unbridled merging of Baby Bells and new communications companies will result in the same monopoly on land phones (and wireless, eventually) broken up in 1984.

Ameritech's service is terrible, and getting worse. They grant service to anyone, including frauds and thieves) with purely verbal information, including increasingly public Social Security numbers (no longer the protected personal asset they once were). This has happened to me, and I was nearly denied a mortgage loan due to Ameritech's ineptitude.

Ameritech's prices are outrageous, and they have steadfastly stalled or blocked local telephone competition in their region, even as they whine about not having unfettered long distance control.

In a capitalist society, the only meaningful role of government in the affairs of the marketplace is as a referee. Government should exist merely to level the playing field and make sure no single competitor is taking advantage by breaking the rules everyone agrees to. The merger of Ameritech/SBC only creates a bigger, stronger team that can bully the referee to call the game any way they wish.

Please do not allow this kind of telecommunications industry consolidation to continue. In the long run, it only lessens competition, stifles technological innovation, and hassles the "little guy" consumer.

-_Russell Gorton
Grand Rapids, Michigan
gorton@umich.edu

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List A B C D E

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

From: Russell Gorton <gorton@umich.edu>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(GTRISTAN),K4DOM.K4PO2(MPOWELL,SNES),K...
Date: Wed, Jun 30, 1999 1:35 PM
Subject: Ameritech/SBC merger

RECEIVED

JUL 29 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

To: FCC Chairman William Kennard: bkennard@fcc.gov
Commissioner Susan Ness: sness@fcc.gov
Commissioner Harold Furchtgott-Roth: hfurchtg@fcc.gov
Commissioner Michael Powell: mpowell@fcc.gov
Commissioner Gloria Tristani: gtristan@fcc.gov

Subj: Ameritech/SBC merger

I'll keep this as brief as possible.

The Ameritech/SBC merger frightens me, a "regular" consumer of telephony services. The unbridled merging of Baby Bells and new communications companies will result in the same monopoly on land phones (and wireless, eventually) broken up in 1984.

Ameritech's service is terrible, and getting worse. They grant service to anyone, including frauds and thieves) with purely verbal information, including increasingly public Social Security numbers (no longer the protected personal asset they once were). This has happened to me, and I was nearly denied a mortgage loan due to Ameritech's ineptitude.

Ameritech's prices are outrageous, and they have steadfastly stalled or blocked local telephone competition in their region, even as they whine about not having unfettered long distance control.

In a capitalist society, the only meaningful role of government in the affairs of the marketplace is as a referee. Government should exist merely to level the playing field and make sure no single competitor is taking advantage by breaking the rules everyone agrees to. The merger of Ameritech/SBC only creates a bigger, stronger team that can bully the referee to call the game any way they wish.

Please do not allow this kind of telecommunications industry consolidation to continue. In the long run, it only lessens competition, stifles technological innovation, and hassles the "little guy" consumer.

- Russell Gorton
Grand Rapids, Michigan
gorton@umich.edu

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List A B C D E

From: Timothy <Sammons@infoserver.fcc.gov>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(BKENNARD)
Date: Tue, Jun 8, 1999 5:02 PM
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

ORIGINAL
RECEIVED

JUL 29 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Timothy (Sammons) writes:

I am encouraged that the FCC has chosen to hold SBC to the highest possible standard in the course of considering its proposed takeover of Ameritech. Please continue your tough, questioning stance. As a residential customer of Ameritech and being in the telecom peripheral manufacturing biz [so I have business exposure to SBC, Ameritech and others], I have personally suffered the poor service and high rates from Ameritech. [Oh, the stories I could tell you!] As a vendor, I know the games they play and how arrogant they are. I have no illusion that anything will improve with SBC and Ameritech combined. Indeed, I fear competition will NOT happen, rates will increase even more, and local service will decline. PLEASE do everything you can legally do to block the SBC Ameritech takeover/merger!

tsammons@starnetinc.com

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 209.224.202.188
Remote IP address: 209.224.202.188

98-141

FX PARTE OR LATE FILED

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List A B C D E

From: Timothy <Sammons@infoserver.fcc.gov>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(BKENNARD)
Date: Tue, Jun 8, 1999 5:02 PM
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

ORIGINAL
RECEIVED

JUL 29 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Timothy (Sammons) writes:

I am encouraged that the FCC has chosen to hold SBC to the highest possible standard in the course of considering its proposed takeover of Ameritech. Please continue your tough, questioning stance. As a residential customer of Ameritech and being in the telecom peripheral manufacturing biz [so I have business exposure to SBC, Ameritech and others], I have personally suffered the poor service and high rates from Ameritech. [Oh, the stories I could tell you!] As a vendor, I know the games they play and how arrogant they are. I have no illusion that anything will improve with SBC and Ameritech combined. Indeed, I fear competition will NOT happen, rates will increase even more, and local service will decline. PLEASE do everything you can legally do to block the SBC Ameritech takeover/merger!

tsammons@starnetinc.com

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 209.224.202.188
Remote IP address: 209.224.202.188

98-141

FX PARTE OR LATE FILED

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List A B C D E

FX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL
RECEIVED

JUL 29 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

98-141

From: ted hayman <haymant@mail.wcresa.k12.mi.us>
To: Mary Izzard <MIZZARD@fcc.gov>
Date: Sat, Jul 17, 1999 9:34 PM
Subject: Re: Comments to the Chairman

Mary Izzard wrote:

>
 > Chairman Kennard requested that I acknowledge receipt of your comment and that it has been forwarded to the Common Carrier Bureau staff for appropriate handling.
 >
 > >>> Ted hayamn <haymant@mail.wcresa.k12.mi.us> 06/08 2:20 PM >>>
 > ted hayamn (haymant@mail.wcresa.k12.mi.us) writes:
 >
 > Please do ot allow Ameritech to merge with SBC. This company still acts unresponsive to it's local customers. Ameritech Media and
 > Ameritech Phone are owned by the same parent company, but because of no local competition they will not respond to my requests for help.
 > Please do allow new companies into ameritech territory to compete and thus give ameritech customers fair service.
 > Bellow is a copy of an e-mail sent to Ameritech today. I challenge you to try to contact this company using their web site or get any satisfaction
 > using their customer relations numbers.
 >
 > I sent the message below to you this morning and after called Ameritech cable and ameritech phone. Ameritech phone informed me that a
 > supervisor would call me later. It has been 5 hours and I have received no call from ameritech.
 > Thank you
 > Ted Hayman 13:48 June 8, 1999
 >
 >
 > In april 1999 I sent \$202 to Ameritech to pay for my two phone lines.
 > line 1 (734 676 4029) and (734 676 4088) .
 >
 > This payment went instead to the Ameritech media.
 >
 > My phone line 734 676 4029 was then disconnected and I was told that a \$40.00 charge would be assessed to re energize my phone.
 >
 > It was at this time that I realized that the payment for my phone actually went to the Ameritech Media.
 >
 > I was informed at this time that Ameritech Media would give the Ameritech phone the extra payment money and everything would be corrected.
 >
 > My new phone bill is in error and I can not understand what happened to my \$202 dollars.
 >
 > I am also told that Ameritech phone can not receive overpayment from Ameritech Media.
 >
 > I was informed last night that if I was not satisfied with the information that Ameritech Phone was giving me I could call my lawyer
 >
 > I want you to hold up an Ameritech phone and an ameritech Media bill. The top of both say Ameritech
 > and could easily be exchanged.
 >
 > I believe that Ameritech is involved in mail fraud and collecting moneys under false pretense
 >
 > Thank You for any assistance you can give me in this matter

No. of Copies rec'd 071
 List A B C D E

>
> Ted Hayman
> 1959 W. Longmeadow
> Trenton, Mi. 48183
>
> cc. U.S. Justice Department
> cc. Michigan PSC
> cc. FCC
> -----
> Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
> Remote host: 204.39.123.97
> Remote IP address: 204.39.123.97
I thank you for your help in this matter.
Ted hayman